

Foundation of Cryptography, Lecture 8

Encryption Schemes

Handout Mode

Iftach Haitner, Tel Aviv University

Tel Aviv University.

April 29, 2014

Section 1

Definitions

Correctness

Definition 1 (encryption scheme)

A triplet of PPTM's (G, E, D) such that

- 1 $G(1^n)$ outputs $(e, d) \in \{0, 1\}^* \times \{0, 1\}^*$
- 2 $E(e, m)$ outputs $c \in \{0, 1\}^*$
- 3 $D(d, c)$ outputs $m \in \{0, 1\}^*$

Correctness: $D(d, E(e, m)) = m$, for any $(e, d) \in \text{Supp}(G(1^n))$ and $m \in \{0, 1\}^*$

- e – encryption key, d – decryption key
- m – plaintext, $c = E(e, m)$ – ciphertext
- $E_e(m) \equiv E(e, m)$ and $D_d(c) \equiv D(d, c)$,
- public/private key

- What would we like to achieve?
- Attempt: for any $m \in \{0, 1\}^*$:

$$(m, E_{(G(1^n)_1)}(m)) \equiv (m, U_{\ell(|m|)})$$

- ▶ Shannon – only possible in case $|m| \leq |G(1^n)_1|$
- ▶ Other concerns: multiple encryptions, active adversaries, ...

Semantic Security

- 1 Ciphertext reveals no "computation information" about the plaintext
- 2 Formulate via the *simulation paradigm*
- 3 Does **not** hide the message *length*

Semantic Security

Definition 2 (Semantic Security — private-key model)

An encryption scheme (G, E, D) is **semantically secure in the private-key model**, if \forall PPTM A , \exists PPTM A' s.t. :

\forall poly-length dist. ensemble $\mathcal{M} = \{\mathcal{M}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and poly-length functions $h, f: \{0, 1\}^* \mapsto \{0, 1\}^*$

$$\left| \Pr_{m \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_n, e \leftarrow G(1^n)_1} [A(1^n, 1^{|m|}, h(1^n, m), E_e(m)) = f(1^n, m)] \right. \\ \left. - \Pr_{m \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_n} [A'(1^n, 1^{|m|}, h(1^n, m)) = f(1^n, m)] \right| = \text{neg}(n)$$

- Non uniformity is inherent.
- Public-key variant — A and A' get e
- Reflection to \mathcal{ZK}
- We sometimes omit 1^n and $1^{|m|}$

Indistinguishability of Encryptions

- The encryption of two strings is indistinguishable
- Less intuitive than semantic security, but easier to work with

Definition 3 (Indistinguishability of encryptions — private-key model)

An encryption scheme (G, E, D) has **indistinguishable encryptions in the private-key model**, if for any $p, \ell \in \text{poly}$, $\{x_n, y_n \in \{0, 1\}^{\ell(n)}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{z_n \in \{0, 1\}^{p(n)}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$

$$\{(z_n, E_e(x_n))_{e \leftarrow G(1^n)_1}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \approx_c \{(z_n, E_e(y_n))_{e \leftarrow G(1^n)_1}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$$

- Non uniformity is inherent.
- Public-key variant — the ensemble contains e

Equivalence of Definitions

Theorem 4

An encryption scheme (G, E, D) is semantically secure iff it has indistinguishable encryptions.

We prove the private key case

Indistinguishability \implies Semantic Security

Fix \mathcal{M} , A , f and h , as in Definition 2.

Algorithm 5 (A')

Input: 1^n , $1^{|m|}$ and $h(m)$

- 1 $e \leftarrow G(1^n)_1$
- 2 $c = E_e(1^{|m|})$
- 3 Output $A(1^n, 1^{|m|}, h(m), c)$

Claim 6

A' is a good simulator for A (according to Definition 2)

Proof: Let

$$\delta(n) := \Pr_{m \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_n, e \leftarrow G(1^n)_1} [A(h(m), E_e(m)) = f(m)] - \Pr_{m \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_n} [A'(h(m)) = f(m)]$$

We define an algorithm that distinguish two between two ensembles $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{y_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, with advantage $\delta(n)$.

Hence, the indistinguishability of (G, E, D) yields that $\delta(n) \leq \text{neg}(n)$.

The Distinguisher

Claim 7

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, exists $x_n \in \text{Supp}(\mathcal{M}_n)$ with
 $\Pr_{e \leftarrow G(1^n)} [A(h(x_n), E_e(x_n)) = f(x_n)] - \Pr [A'(h(x_n)) = f(x_n)] \geq \delta(n).$

Proof: ?

Algorithm 8 (B)

Input: $1^n, 1^t, h', f', c$

Output 1 iff $A(1^n, 1^t, h', c) = f'$

Let $\{z_n = (1^n, 1^{|x_n|}, h(x_n), f(x_n))\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.

- $\Pr_{e \leftarrow G(1^n)} [B(z_n, E_e(x_n)) = 1] = \Pr_{e \leftarrow G(1^n)} [A(1^n, 1^{|x_n|}, h(x_n), E_e(x_n)) = f(x_n)]$
- $\Pr_{e \leftarrow G(1^n)} [B(z_n, E_e(1^{|x_n|})) = 1] = \Pr [A'(1^n, 1^{|x_n|}, h(x_n)) = f(x_n)]$

Hence,

$$\Pr_{e \leftarrow G(1^n)} [B(z_n, E_e(x_n)) = 1] - \Pr_{e \leftarrow G(1^n)} [B(z_n, E_e(1^{|x_n|})) = 1] \geq \delta(n),$$

Semantic Security \implies Indistinguishability

For PPT B , $\{x_n, y_n \in \{0, 1\}^{\ell(n)}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{z_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, let

$$\delta(n) = \Pr_{e \leftarrow G(1^n)_1} [B(z_n, E_e(x_n)) = 1] - \Pr_{e \leftarrow G(1^n)_1} [B(z_n, E_e(y_n)) = 1]$$

We define distribution \mathcal{M} , functions f, h and algorithm A that has $\delta(n)/4$ simulator. The semantic security of (G, E, D) yields that $\delta(n) \leq \text{neg}(n)$.

Let $f(x_n) = 1$ and $f(y_n) = 0$, and let $A(w)$ output 1 if $B(w) = 1$, and a uniform bit otherwise.

Claim 9

$$\Pr_{e \leftarrow G(1^n)_1, t_n \leftarrow \{x_n, y_n\}} [A(z_n, E_e(t_n)) = f(t_n)] = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\delta(n)}{4}$$

Proof: Let $\alpha(n) = \Pr_{e \leftarrow G(1^n)_1} [B(z_n, E_e(x_n)) = 1]$.

$$\Pr_{e \leftarrow G(1^n)_1} [A(z_n, E_e(x_n)) = f(x_n)] = \alpha(n) + \frac{1}{2}(1 - \alpha(n)) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\alpha(n)}{2}$$

and

$$\Pr_{e \leftarrow G(1^n)_1} [A(z_n, E_e(y_n)) = f(y_n)] = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\delta(n) - \alpha(n)}{2}$$

Semantic Security \implies Indistinguishability, cont.

- Let \mathcal{M}_n be x_n w.p. $\frac{1}{2}$, and y_n otherwise.
- Let $h(1^n, \cdot) = z_n$, and recall $f(x_n) = 1$ and $f(y_n) = 0$.

By Claim 9:

$$\Pr_{m \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_n, e \leftarrow G(1^n)_1} [A(h(1^n, m), E_e(m)) = f(m)] = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\delta(n)}{2}$$

But, for any A' :

$$\Pr_{m \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_n, e \leftarrow G(1^n)_1} [A'(h(1^n, m)) = f(m)] \leq \frac{1}{2}$$

Hence, $\delta(n) \leq \text{neg}(n)$.

Security Under Multiple Encryptions

Definition 10 (Indistinguishability for multiple encryptions – private-key model)

An encryption scheme (G, E, D) has **indistinguishable encryptions for multiple messages in the private-key model**, if for any $p, \ell, t \in \text{poly}$, $\{x_{n,1}, \dots, x_{n,t(n)}, y_{n,1}, \dots, y_{n,t(n)} \in \{0, 1\}^{\ell(n)}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, $\{z_n \in \{0, 1\}^{p(n)}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, PPTM B :

$$\left| \Pr_{e \leftarrow G(1^n)_1} [B(z_n, E_e(x_{n,1}), \dots, E_e(x_{n,t(n)})) = 1] - \Pr_{e \leftarrow G(1^n)_1} [B(z_n, E_e(y_{n,1}), \dots, E_e(y_{n,t(n)})) = 1] \right| = \text{neg}(n)$$

Extensions:

- Different length messages
- Semantic security version
- Public-key variant

Multiple Encryption in the Public-Key Model

Theorem 11

A **public-key** encryption scheme has indistinguishable encryptions for multiple messages, **iff** it has indistinguishable encryptions for a single message.

Proof: Let (G, E, D) be a public-key encryption scheme that has **no** indistinguishable encryptions for multiple messages, with respect to PPT B , $\{x_{n,1}, \dots, x_{n,t(n)}, y_{n,1}, \dots, y_{n,t(n)} \in \{0, 1\}^{\ell(n)}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, \{z_n \in \{0, 1\}^{p(n)}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.

Hence, for some function $i(n) \in [t(n)]$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \Pr_{e \leftarrow G(1^n)} [B(1^n, e, E_e(x_{n,1}), \dots, E_e(x_{n,i-1}), E_e(y_{n,i}), \dots, E_e(y_{n,t(n)})) = 1] \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \Pr_{e \leftarrow G(1^n)} [B(1^n, e, E_e(x_{n,1}), \dots, E_e(x_{n,i}), E_e(y_{n,i+1}), \dots, E_e(y_{n,t(n)})) = 1] \right| \\ & > \text{neg}(n). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, (G, E, D) has no indistinguishable encryptions for **single** message:

Algorithm 12 (B')

Input: $1^n, z_n = (i(n), x_{n,1}, \dots, x_{n,t(n)}, y_{n,1}, \dots, y_{n,t(n)}), e, c$

Return $B(c, E_e(x_{n,1}), \dots, E_e(x_{n,i-1}), c, E_e(y_{n,i+1}), \dots, E_e(y_{n,t(n)}))$

Multiple Encryption in the Private-Key Model

Fact 13

*Assuming (non uniform) OWFs exists, then \exists encryption scheme that has private-key indistinguishable encryptions for a single messages, but **not** for multiple messages.*

Proof: Let $g: \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^{n+1}$ be a (non-uniform) PRG, and for $i \in \mathbb{N}$ let g^i be its "iterated extension" to output of length $n + i$ (see Lecture 2).

Construction 14

- $G(1^n)$: outputs $e \leftarrow \{0, 1\}^n$
- $E_e(m)$: outputs $g^{|m|}(e) \oplus m$
- $D_e(c)$: outputs $g^{|c|}(e) \oplus c$

Multiple Encryption in the Private-Key Model, cont.

Claim 15

(G, E, D) has private-key indistinguishable encryptions for a single message

Proof: Assume not, and let B , $\{x_n, y_n \in \{0, 1\}^{\ell(n)}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{z_n \in \{0, 1\}^{p(n)}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the triplet that realizes it:

$$|\Pr[B(z_n, g^{\ell(n)}(U_n) \oplus x_n) = 1] - \Pr[B(z_n, g^{\ell(n)}(U_n) \oplus y_n) = 1]| > \text{neg}(n) \quad (1)$$

Hence, B yields a (non-uniform) distinguisher for g . (?)

Claim 16

(G, E, D) does not have a private-key indistinguishable encryptions for multiple messages

Proof: Take $x_{n,1} = x_{n,2}$ and $y_{n,1} \neq y_{n,2}$, and let B be the algorithm that on input (c_1, c_2) , outputs 1 iff $c_1 = c_2$. \square

Section 2

Constructions

Private-Key Indistinguishable Encryptions for Multiple Messages

Suffices to encrypt messages of some fixed length (here the length is n). (?)

Let \mathcal{F} be a (non-uniform) length-preserving PRF

Construction 17

- $G(1^n)$: output $e \leftarrow \mathcal{F}_n$
- $E_e(m)$: choose $r \leftarrow \{0, 1\}^n$ and output $(r, e(r) \oplus m)$
- $D_e(r, c)$: output $e(r) \oplus c$

Claim 18

(G, E, D) has private-key indistinguishable encryptions for a multiple messages

Proof: ?

Public-key indistinguishable encryptions for multiple messages

Let (G_T, f, Inv) be a (non-uniform) TDP, and let b be hardcore predicate for it.

Construction 19 (bit encryption)

- $G(1^n)$: output $(e, d) \leftarrow G_T(1^n)$
- $E_e(m)$: choose $r \leftarrow \{0, 1\}^n$ and output $(y = f_e(r), c = b(r) \oplus m)$
- $D_d(y, c)$: output $b(\text{Inv}_d(y)) \oplus c$

Claim 20

(G, E, D) has public-key indistinguishable encryptions for a multiple messages

Proof:

We believe that public-key encryptions schemes are “more complex” than private-key ones

Section 3

Active Adversaries

Active Adversaries

- Chosen plaintext attack (CPA):

The adversary can ask for encryption and choose the messages to distinguish accordingly

- Chosen ciphertext attack (CCA):

The adversary can also ask for **decryptions** of certain messages

- In the public-key settings, the adversary is also given the public key
- We focus on indistinguishability, but each of the above definitions has an equivalent semantic security variant.

CPA Security

Let (G, E, D) be an encryption scheme. For a pair of algorithms $A = (A_1, A_2)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $z \in \{0, 1\}^*$ and $b \in \{0, 1\}$, let:

Experiment 21 ($\text{Exp}_{A,n,z}^{\text{CPA}}(b)$)

- 1 $(e, d) \leftarrow G(1^n)$
- 2 $(m_0, m_1, s) \leftarrow A_1^{E_e(\cdot)}(1^n, z)$, where $|m_0| = |m_1|$.
- 3 $c \leftarrow E_e(m_b)$
- 4 Output $A_2^{E_e(\cdot)}(1^n, s, c)$

Definition 22 (private key CPA)

(G, E, D) has **indistinguishable encryptions in the private-key model** under CPA attack, if \forall PPT A_1, A_2 , and poly-bounded $\{z_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$:

$$|\Pr[\text{Exp}_{A,n,z_n}^{\text{CPA}}(0) = 1] - \Pr[\text{Exp}_{A,n,z_n}^{\text{CPA}}(1) = 1]| = \text{neg}(n)$$

CPA Security, cont.

- public-key variant.
- The scheme from Construction 17 has indistinguishable encryptions in the private-key model under CPA attack (for short, private-key CPA secure)
- The scheme from Construction 19 has indistinguishable encryptions in the public-key model under CPA attack (for short, public-key CPA secure)
- In both cases, definitions are not equivalent (?)

Experiment 23 ($\text{Exp}_{A,n,z}^{\text{CCA1}}(b)$)

- 1 $(e, d) \leftarrow G(1^n)$
- 2 $(m_0, m_1, s) \leftarrow A_1^{E_e(\cdot), D_d(\cdot)}(1^n, z)$, where $|m_0| = |m_1|$.
- 3 $c \leftarrow E_e(m_b)$
- 4 Output $A_2^{E_e(\cdot)}(1^n, s, c)$

Experiment 24 ($\text{Exp}_{A,n,z_n}^{\text{CCA2}}(b)$)

- 1 $(e, d) \leftarrow G(1^n)$
- 2 $(m_0, m_1, s) \leftarrow A_1^{E_e(\cdot), D_d(\cdot)}(1^n, z)$, where $|m_0| = |m_1|$.
- 3 $c \leftarrow E_e(m_b)$
- 4 Output $A_2^{E_e(\cdot), D_d^{-c}(\cdot)}(1^n, s, c)$

Definition 25 (private key CCA1/CCA2)

(G, E, D) has **indistinguishable encryptions in the private-key model** under $x \in \{\text{CCA1}, \text{CCA2}\}$ attack, if \forall PPT A_1, A_2 , and poly-bounded $\{z_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$:

$$|\Pr[\text{Exp}_{A,n,z_n}^x(0) = 1] - \Pr[\text{Exp}_{A,n,z_n}^x(1) = 1]| = \text{neg}(n)$$

- The public key definition is analogous

Private-key CCA2

- Is the scheme from **Construction 17** private-key **CCA1** secure?
- **CCA2** secure?

Let (G, E, D) be a private-key **CPA** scheme, and let $(\text{Gen}_M, \text{Mac}, \text{Vrfy})$ be an existential unforgeable strong MAC.

Construction 26

- $G'(1^n)$: Output $(e \leftarrow G_E(1^n), k \leftarrow \text{Gen}_M(1^n))$.^a
- $E'_{e,k}(m)$: let $c = E_e(m)$ and output $(c, t = \text{Mac}_k(c))$
- $D_{e,k}(c, t)$: if $\text{Vrfy}_k(c, t) = 1$, output $D_e(c)$. Otherwise, output \perp

^aWe assume wlg. that the encryption and decryption keys are the same.

Theorem 27

Construction 26 is a private-key **CCA2**-secure encryption scheme.

Proof: An attacker on the **CCA2**-security of (G', E', D') yields an attacker on the **CPA** security of (G, E, D) , or the existential unforgeability of $(\text{Gen}_M, \text{Mac}, \text{Vrfy})$.

Public-key CCA1

Let (G, E, D) be a public-key CPA scheme and let (P, V) be a \mathcal{NIZK} for $\mathcal{L} = \{(c_0, c_1, pk_0, pk_1) : \exists(m, z_0, z_1) \text{ s.t. } c_0 = E_{pk_0}(m, z_0) \wedge c_1 = E_{pk_1}(m, z_1)\}$

Construction 28 (The Naor-Yung Paradigm)

- $G'(1^n)$:
 - 1 For $i \in \{0, 1\}$: set $(sk_i, pk_i) \leftarrow G(1^n)$.
 - 2 Let $r \leftarrow \{0, 1\}^{\ell(n)}$, and output $pk' = (pk_0, pk_1, r)$ and $sk' = (pk', sk_0, sk_1)$
- $E'_{pk'}(m)$:
 - 1 For $i \in \{0, 1\}$: set $c_i = E_{pk_i}(m, z_i)$, where z_i is a uniformly chosen string of the right length
 - 2 $\pi \leftarrow P((c_0, c_1, pk_0, pk_1), (m, z_0, z_1), r)$
 - 3 Output (c_0, c_1, π) .
- $D'_{sk'}(c_0, c_1, \pi)$: If $V((c_0, c_1, pk_0, pk_1), \pi, r) = 1$, return $D_{sk_0}(c_0)$. Otherwise, return \perp .

Public-key CCA1, cont.

- We assume for simplicity that the encryption key output by $G(1^n)$ is of length at least n . (?)
- ℓ is an arbitrary polynomial, and determines the maximum message length to encrypt using "security parameter" n .

Is the scheme CCA1 secure? We need the \mathcal{NIZK} to be adaptive secure.

Theorem 29

Assuming (P, V) is adaptive secure, then Construction 28 is a public-key CCA1 secure encryption scheme.

Proof: Given an attacker A' for the CCA1 security of (G', E', D') , we use it to construct an attacker A on the CPA security of (G, E, D) or the adaptive security of (P, V) .

Proving Thm 29

Let $S = (S_1, S_2)$ be the (adaptive) simulator for (P, V, \mathcal{L})

Algorithm 30 (A)

Input: $(1^n, pk)$

- ➊ Let $j \leftarrow \{0, 1\}$, $pk_{1-j} = pk$, $(pk_j, sk_j) \leftarrow G(1^n)$ and $(r, s) \leftarrow S_1(1^n)$
- ➋ Emulate $A'(1^n, pk' = (pk_0, pk_1, r))$:
On query (c_0, c_1, π) of A' to D' :
If $V((c_0, c_1, pk_0, pk_1), \pi, r) = 1$, answer $D_{sk_j}(c_j)$.
Otherwise, answer \perp .
- ➌ Output the pair (m_0, m_1) that A' outputs
- ➍ On challenge $c (= E_{pk}(m_b))$:
 - ▶ Set $c_{1-j} = c$, $c_j = E_{pk_j}(m_a)$ for $a \leftarrow \{0, 1\}$, and $\pi \leftarrow S_2((c_0, c_1, pk_0, pk_1), r, s)$
 - ▶ Send $c' = (c_0, c_1, \pi)$ to A'
- ➎ Output the value that A' does

Proving Thm 29, cont.

Claim 31

Assume A' breaks the CCA1 security of (G', E', D') w.p. $\delta(n)$, then A breaks the CPA security of (G, E, D) w.p. $(\delta(n) - \text{neg}(n))/2$.

The adaptive soundness and adaptive zero-knowledge of (P, V) , yields that

$$\Pr[A' \text{ "makes" } A(1^n) \text{ decrypt an invalid cipher}] = \text{neg}(n) \quad (2)$$

Assume for simplicity that the above prob is 0.

Hence, no information about j has leaked to A through the first stage.

Let $A'(1^n, x, y)$ be A' 's output in the emulation induced by $A(1^n)$, conditioned on $a = x$ and $b = y$.

It holds that

- 1 Since no information about j has leaked, $A'(1^n, 0, 1) \equiv A'(1^n, 1, 0)$
- 2 The guarantee about A' and the adaptive zero-knowledge of (P, V) , yields $|\Pr[A'(1^n, 1, 1) = 1] - \Pr[A'(1^n, 0, 0) = 1]| \geq \delta(n) - \text{neg}(n)$

Proving Thm 29, cont..

Let $A(b)$ be A 's output on challenge $(1^n, b)$.

$$\begin{aligned} & |\Pr[A(1) = 1] - \Pr[A(0) = 1]| \\ &= \left| \frac{1}{2}(\Pr[A'(0, 1) = 1] + \Pr[A'(1, 1) = 1]) - \frac{1}{2}(\Pr[A'(0, 0) = 1] + \Pr[A'(1, 0) = 1]) \right| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} |\Pr[A'(1, 1) = 1] - \Pr[A'(0, 0) = 1]| - \frac{1}{2} |\Pr[A'(1, 0) = 1] - \Pr[A'(0, 1) = 1]| \\ &\geq (\delta(n) - \text{neg}(n))/2 - 0 \end{aligned}$$

Public-key CCA2

- Is **Construction 28 CCA2** secure?
- **Problem:** Soundness might **not hold** with respect to the simulated CRS, after seeing a proof for an **invalid** statement
- **Solution:** use **simulation sound** \mathcal{NIZK}